

Appln. No. 10/714,021
Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 19 2007

REMARKS

§112 Rejections

Claims 1-4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. More specifically, the Examiner objected to the phrase "at least three times greater". Applicant has amended claim 1. Claim 1 now specifies "the first magnetic layer having a thickness approximately five times greater than a thickness of the second magnetic layer". As recognized by the Examiner, this amendment is supported by the description of the invention provided in Applicant's specification. More specifically, Table 5 describes Examples of Applicant's invention wherein the upper magnetic layer has a thickness of 0.5µm and the lower magnetic layer has a thickness of 2.5µm. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claim 1 was rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112 for indefiniteness. In particular claim 1 includes the phrases "lower magnetic layer" and "upper magnetic layer". Claim 1 has been amended and now recites "first magnetic layer" and "second magnetic layer". Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,045,901 to Hashimoto in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0152806 to Murayama. Claims 1-4 and 8 were also rejected as

Appln. No. 10/714,021
Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2007

being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,010,773 to Murayama in view of Hashimoto and further in view of the Murayama '806.

Claim 1 has been amended to require that the thickness of the first magnetic layer is approximately five times greater than the thickness of the second magnetic layer.

Claim 1 has been further amended to include the limitation that the combined thickness of the first and second magnetic layers is approximately 3.0 μm . The references cited neither disclose nor suggest a recording medium in which the thickness of the first magnetic layer is approximately five times greater than the thickness of the second magnetic layer and wherein the combined thickness of the first and second magnetic layers is approximately 3.0 μm .

Applicant asserts that amended claim 1 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended claim 1.

Claims 2-4 and 8 depend from claim 1. Applicant asserts that because claim 1 is allowable, claims 2-4 and 8 are also allowable. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-4 and 8.

Date: 4/19/07

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Depke, Reg. No. 37,607
**ROCKEY, DEPKE, LYONS
& KITZINGER, LLC**

Suite 3450, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-6306
Tel: (312) 277-2006
Attorneys for Applicant